



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of political theory. It is, perhaps, the best brief synthesis which has yet been presented of the newer points of view in political theory. It is a significant fact, however, that though this book will appear even savagely revolutionary to conventional political theorists, its premises and general philosophy have been sociological commonplaces for a generation. This is an eloquent commentary on the degree to which political theory has lagged behind general sociological thought. It is to be regretted that the book is marred by careless proof-reading, which in some cases has destroyed the sense of the passage, as, for example, "cure" for "case" (page 13), "the" for "and" (53), "useful" for "useless" (82), "involves" for "requires" (137), "start" for "state" (156).

HARRY ELMER BARNES.

CLARK UNIVERSITY.

Parliament and Revolution. By J. RAMSAY MACDONALD.
New York, Scott and Seltzer, 1920.—180 pp.

The fair hopes of the fathers of modern democracy have not been fully realized. Universal suffrage has not proved to be a universal panacea; it has not purged society of all its inequalities and injustices. On the contrary, its progress has been accompanied by the growth of swollen fortunes, the rise of the capitalist press, the evolution of the party boss and other things equally undemocratic. In all countries revolutionary groups have arisen, proclaiming that political democracy has failed and that there is no health in it, that the conditions essential to its success do not exist and cannot be secured within the present social and political framework, that only revolution can effect the necessary changes in the nature of society and the state.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's *Parliament and Revolution* is a socialist's defence of the parliamentary as opposed to the revolutionary method of reform. He agrees with revolutionists that parliamentary democracy operating in a capitalist society is capitalist. "Capitalism", he says, "assuming that majorities are passive and accept the thoughts and the wills of minorities, pursues a political policy of subjection which it carries on by reason of its wealth and its economic control of the existing order. . . . We have now the dictatorship of the capitalist." But it does not follow, in his opinion, that the best remedy is the dictatorship of the proletariat. He objects to labor "arming itself from capitalist arsenals". He is afraid of the dictatorship of the proletariat not because it is proletarian but because it is dictatorial, because it means repression, censorship, coun-

ter-revolution and all the paraphernalia of revolutionary tyranny. He rejects as false the argument that only by revolution can capitalism be transformed into socialism. "A Parliamentary election will give us"—Mr. Macdonald is writing both as a socialist and as a member of the Independent Labor Party—"all the power that Lenin had to get by a revolution, and such a majority can proceed to effect the transition from capitalism to socialism with the co-operation of the people, and not merely by edict." Even Lenin has admitted that the transitional period of dictatorship and repression in Russia, during which society is to be recast in a socialist mould, must be very long; and in England, Mr. Macdonald believes, such a period would be much longer. The prospect fills him with dismay. "No Socialist Party would tolerate such a thing for long." It is part of his social philosophy that progressive ideas lead to revolution only when repression makes them explosive. Socialists must be willing to face revolution if stupid reactionaries force it, but "to plan a revolution in order to impose a new system on Society is folly or worse".

In a chapter on "Direct Action" the author touches upon one of the gravest problems of government today. He does not regard direct action, *i. e.*, industrial action for a political purpose, as inherently wrong. Resort to it to control the action of a capitalist state is legitimate, the question in any given case being one of expediency. It cannot, however, become a regular and normal part of democratic activity, but can be employed only "in a state of strong popular indignation, when the behavior of those in power is such that the ordinary political mind of the people is upset, and that confidence in Parliament is forfeited—when, in fact, Governments have created revolutionary conditions". Under any other circumstances an attempt at direct action—say a general strike to overthrow a ministry or to prevent war—would fail ignominiously. With regard to more normal times, Mr. Macdonald's conclusion seems to be that direct action is proper only when political action is "bad". "Get the proper Parliament, and political 'direct action' is unnecessary for Labour". His discussion of direct action is not calculated to reassure harassed statesmen or orthodox political scientists or conservatives generally; but it is not to such that his book is addressed. If it convinces revolutionists of the efficacy of parliamentarism, it will have served its purpose.

In an advertisement of this volume, printed on the jacket, the publishers tell us that it "is the first scientific and entirely un-

biased argument against Bolshevism in favor of democratic representative government by majorities". In general such notices need not detain the reader, but there is an air of earnest conviction about this one that arrests attention. We feel that Messrs. Scott and Seltzer have been moved fully as much by the missionary spirit as by considerations of salesmanship. As a description of the book, however, the advertisement is as grotesque as it is evidently sincere. *Parliament and Revolution* is polemic, not scientific or unbiased, and it is intended to show nothing else so much as that Mr. MacDonald's party is the surest and safest instrumentality of progress in England.

R. L. SCHUYLER.

The Second Period of Quakerism. By WILLIAM C. BRAITHWAITE. London, The Macmillan Company, 1919.—xlviii, 668 pp.

The first important history of the Friends was that by William Sewel, an Anglo-Dutch Quaker, early in the eighteenth century, and not until within the last decade have we had any large contributions in this field. Eight years ago Mr. Braithwaite published his *Beginnings of Quakerism*, which has been followed by R. M. Jones's *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Miss Brailsford's *Quaker Women, 1650-1690*, Miss Hodgkin's *A Book of Quaker Saints*, Brayshaw's *The Personality of George Fox*, and Professor Jones's recent book on Fox. In addition we are promised by this last author a concluding volume to the one under review.

This seems to be an undue emphasis upon a religious movement which at the height of its spiritual development boasted no more than 25,000 members (page 458). Yet its history is in itself a history of toleration in England during the middle years of the seventeenth century, a history of that self-conscious socialized mysticism which shadows forth the psychological growth of an extraordinary type of Christianity, strikingly similar in many respects to the experience of the early Christians, and all the more notable for the wealth of contemporary evidence left us by Quaker leaders thoroughly convinced of the greatness of their mission.

The Second Period of Quakerism is a continuation of Mr. Braithwaite's *Beginnings* and covers the period from the Restoration to the Affirmation Act of 1722. It was a period of repression and persecution, until the Toleration Act of 1689, and was characterized by a change in Quakerism itself as well as in the attitude of the government toward Quakers. By 1660 Fox and his disciples had thor-